



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,449	01/23/2001	David S. Matthews	XER 2 0381 D/A0617	2428

7590 09/08/2004

Albert P. Sharpe, III, Esq.
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan
Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/767,449	MATTHEWS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A Thompson	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alimpich (US Patent 6,128,017) in view of Franklin (US Patent 5,852,436).

Regarding claim 1: Alimpich discloses a graphical user interface system (figure 4 of Alimpich) comprising a fault screen window (figure 4(53) of Alimpich) depicting faults (errors) (column 4, lines 16-21 of Alimpich) for individual supply unit devices and output unit devices (column 4, lines 26-30 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly a fault notes window for user editable text linked to said fault screen window.

Franklin discloses a notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) for user editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin) linked to a screen window (figure 7(71) and column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical

Art Unit: 2624

user interface system of Alimpich to create user-editable fault notes in said fault screen window. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 13: Alimpich discloses a method comprising the step of displaying a fault screen (figure 4(53) and column 4, lines 16-21 of Alimpich) including at least one device fault button (figure 4(52) (button also shown as figure 2(51)); and column 4, lines 14-16 and lines 19-21 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly displaying a fault notes window; accepting user editable text in a box in said fault notes window; and displaying user editable text in said box in said fault notes window.

Franklin discloses displaying a notes window (figure 7(67) and column 7, lines 18-21 of Franklin); accepting user editable text in a box (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin) inside of a window to which said box is attached (figure 7(71) and column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin); and displaying user editable text in said box in said window (figure 7(64) and column 7, lines 18-21 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person

Art Unit: 2624

of ordinary skill in the art to display notes window, as taught by Franklin, to create user-editable fault notes in a fault screen window, as taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Regarding claims 2 and 14: Alimpich discloses that said fault screen window is accessed by selecting a button (figure 4(52) of Alimpich) on a larger window (figure 4(50) and column 4, lines 19-21 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window is accessed by selecting a notes button on said fault screen window.

Franklin discloses that a notes window is accessed by selecting a notes button in a window (figure 10(92) and column 7, lines 62-67 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select said fault notes window by selecting a notes button, as taught by Franklin, said notes window being placed inside a larger window, as taught by Alimpich. Since the fault notes window is inside the fault screen window, as discussed above in the arguments regarding claim 1 and in the arguments regarding claim 13, said larger window would be said fault screen window taught by Alimpich.

Art Unit: 2624

The motivation for doing so would have been to have a means to access the user-editable error messages and see the error state (column 4, lines 39-43 of Alimpich).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2 and 14.

Regarding claims 3 and 15: Alimpich in view of Franklin disclose that said fault notes window is accessed by selecting a notes button on said fault screen window, as discussed above in the arguments regarding claims 2 and 14, which are incorporated herein.

Franklin further discloses that said notes window is accessed by selecting a notes icon (figure 8(76) of Franklin) on the screen window to which said notes window is attached (column 7, lines 29-37 of Franklin). As is well known in the art, selecting a collapsed iconic version of a window will expand said window, thus allowing access.

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select said fault notes window by selecting a notes icon, as taught by Franklin, said notes window being placed inside a larger window, as taught by Alimpich. Since the fault notes window is inside the fault screen window, as discussed above in the arguments regarding claim 1 and in the arguments regarding claim 13, said larger window would be said fault screen window taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a representation of said fault notes window that does not take up as much space when it is not needed (column 7, lines 32-35 of Franklin).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3 and 15.

Regarding claims 4 and 16: Alimpich discloses that a specific button (figure 4(52b) of Alimpich) for said fault screen window is configured to appear when fault text has previously appeared in said fault screen window (column 4, lines 39-41 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes icon is configured to appear when user editable text has previously been entered on said fault notes window.

Franklin discloses that said notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) is attached to a window (figure 7(71) of Franklin) and positioned inside said window (column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin) and said notes icon (figure 8(76) of Franklin) can be used to access said notes window (column 7, lines 29-37 of Franklin) which already has user-editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin).

Therefore, for a notes icon to appear, user-editable text must already have been previously entered into said notes window.

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have said notes icon appear when user-editable text has been entered into said notes window, as taught by Franklin, said notes icon and said notes window being used to list device faults, as taught by Alimpich, thus making said notes window a fault notes window and said notes icon a fault notes icon. The

motivation for doing so would have been to give a smaller, collapsed representation of said fault notes window while still providing a clear indication as to what item said fault notes window is anchored (column 7, lines 32-35 of Franklin). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 16.

3. Claims 5-12 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alimpich (US Patent 6,128,017) in view of Franklin (US Patent 5,852,436) and Knodt (US Patent 5,987,535).

Regarding claim 7: Alimpich discloses a graphical user interface system (figure 4 of Alimpich) comprising a view selection window (figure 4 of Alimpich) including a fault button (figure 4(52) (button also shown as figure 2(51)) of Alimpich) which opens a window (figure 4(53) of Alimpich) displaying recent faults that have occurred in said printing system (column 4, lines 14-16 and lines 19-21 of Alimpich).

Said system further comprises a system window (figure 4(window labeled "Printers" with a tabulated listing of the printers of the system) of Alimpich) that provides an overall system view of said printing system including a plurality of boxes representing devices comprising said printing system. As can be clearly seen in figure 4, there are a plurality of boxes in a system window representing "Printer 1", "Printer 2", "Printer 3", and "Printer 4" under the icon and heading "Printers".

Said system further comprises a fault screen window (figure 4(53) and column 4, lines 2-5 of Alimpich) depicting faults (errors) (column 4, lines 16-21 of Alimpich) for

individual supply unit devices and output unit devices (column 4, lines 26-30 of Alimpich), wherein said fault screen window is opened by selecting said fault button and/or said fault icon (column 4, lines 41-43 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said devices comprising said printer system are represented by a plurality of icons; a fault icon for each device having a fault condition that is displayed in the proximity of an icon representing said device; and a fault notes window for user editable text linked to said fault screen window.

Franklin discloses a notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) for user editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin) linked to a screen window (figure 7(71) and column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical user interface system of Alimpich to create user-editable fault notes in said fault screen window. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich.

Alimpich in view of Franklin does not disclose expressly that said devices comprising said printer system are represented by a plurality of icons; and a fault icon

for each device having a fault condition that is displayed in the proximity of an icon representing said device.

Knodt discloses representing the devices of a printer system with a plurality of icons (column 4, lines 18-25 of Knodt), as can clearly be seen in figure 5 of Knodt. Figure 5 of Knodt contains an icon for the scanner (shaped like a computer and near the words "Scan to File"), the fax machine (shaped like a phone receiver and one near the words "Fax Out" and one to the left of the words "Fax In"), the copier (shaped like overlapping document pages and near the words "Copy Jobs"), and the printer (shaped like a computer and to the left of the words "Print Jobs").

Knodt further discloses an icon for each device (figure 5(62) of Knodt) having a status condition that is displayed in the proximity of an icon representing said device (column 4, lines 34-39 of Knodt). The icon (figure 5(62) of Knodt) shows a print job status (column 4, lines 34-39 of Knodt) and, as can be seen in figure 5 of Knodt, is clearly in the proximity of an icon representing the corresponding device.

Alimpich in view of Franklin is combinable with Knodt because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use icons to represent the devices of the printer system and the status of said devices, as taught by Knodt, said status being the fault status taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to immediately present to an operator the status of the system (column 2, lines 14-18 of Knodt) since a system with multiple components can aggravate the level of confusion in properly

setting up print jobs (column 1, lines 26-30 of Knodt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Knodt with Alimpich in view of Franklin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Regarding claims 5, 8 and 17: Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window displays only user editable text related to a selected device.

Franklin discloses that said notes window displays user-editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical user interface system of Alimpich to create user-editable fault notes in said fault screen window. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich.

Alimpich in view of Franklin does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window displays only user editable text related to a selected device.

Knodt discloses providing information related to the status of a particular selected device (column 4, lines 17-25 of Knodt).

Alimpich in view of Franklin is combinable with Knodt because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the fault notes window to display user editable text, as taught by Alimpich in view of Franklin, said user editable text being only related to a selected device, as taught by Knodt. The motivation for doing so would have been immediately present to an operator with the status of the individual devices and component of a system (column 2, lines 14-18 of Knodt) since a system with multiple components can aggravate the level of confusion in properly setting up print jobs (column 1, lines 26-30 of Knodt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Knodt with Alimpich in view of Franklin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 8 and 17.

Regarding claims 6, 9 and 18: Alimpich discloses does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window displays only user editable text related to said system when no device is selected.

Franklin discloses that said notes window displays user-editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical user interface system of Alimpich to create user-editable fault notes in said fault screen

window. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich.

Alimpich in view of Franklin does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window displays only user editable text related to said system when no device is selected.

Knodt discloses that if a device is not selected for use, the display of said device will be altered to a phantom designation if said device is not available in the system (column 4, lines 27-31 of Knodt). If all of the devices are not selected for use, then all of the devices will therefore be given a phantom designation. The only status that would be left is the status of the overall system.

Alimpich in view of Franklin is combinable with Knodt because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the fault notes window to display user editable text, as taught by Alimpich in view of Franklin, said user editable text being only related to said system when no device is selected, as taught by Knodt. The motivation for doing so would have been immediately present to an operator with the status of the system (column 2, lines 14-18 of Knodt), including the multiple disabled components.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Knodt with Alimpich in view of Franklin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6, 9 and 18.

Regarding claim 10: Alimpich discloses that said fault screen window is accessed by selecting a button (figure 4(52) of Alimpich) on a larger window (figure 4(50) and column 4, lines 19-21 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window is accessed by selecting a notes button and/or a fault notes icon on said fault screen window.

Franklin further discloses that said notes window is accessed by selecting a notes icon (figure 8(76) of Franklin) on the screen window to which said notes window is attached (column 7, lines 29-37 of Franklin). As is well known in the art, selecting a collapsed iconic version of a window will expand said window, thus allowing access.

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select said fault notes window by selecting a notes icon, as taught by Franklin, said notes window being placed inside a larger window, as taught by Alimpich. Since the fault notes window is inside the fault screen window, as discussed above in the arguments regarding claim 7, said larger window would be said fault screen window taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a representation of said fault notes window that does not take up as much space when it is not needed (column 7, lines 32-35 of Franklin). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claim

10.

Regarding claim 11: The arguments regarding claims 4 and 16 are incorporated herein.

Regarding claim 12: Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window is opened automatically whenever said fault notes window contains user editable text.

Franklin discloses that said notes window is opened automatically whenever the larger window, to which said notes window is attached, is opened (figure 7 and column 7, lines 26-28 of Franklin). If the note is attached in expanded form, as shown in figure 7 of Franklin, then whenever the larger window to which said notes window is attached is opened, the notes window will automatically be opened. Said notes window contains user editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 of Franklin) when said notes window is attached to said larger window (column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin). Therefore, said notes window is opened automatically whenever said notes window contains user editable text.

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to open said notes window automatically whenever said notes window contains user editable text, as taught by Franklin, said notes window displaying fault messages, as taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to

immediately display the fault note text for the corresponding attached section (figure 7(64) of Franklin). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-6329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624



JAT
August 2, 2004

THOMAS D.
~~BERRY~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER